Boards of County Commissioners.

Mayors or City Councils.
County or City Planning Commissions.
Local or Regional Environmental Agencies.

Meetings with clearinghouse officials or local government agencies to discuss the proposed program will be held at the discretion of the Area Manager. However, if a local agency requests a conference, every effort should be made to comply. Conferences with local agencies should be coordinated with the division responsible for the proposed action so that all BPA personnel who should participate in the conference can be notified.

4. Review of Draft Statements by the public. Review of Draft Statements by the public will be accomplished by (1) announcement in the FEDERAL REGISTER and in appropriate newspapers throughout BPA's service area that copies for the public are available at Area, District, and Headquarters Offices and where appropriate, local libraries or public offices, and (2) public meetings near the site of the important proposed actions, where appropriate.

The press announcement making the Environmental Statement available to the public and a notice of the public meetings in the FEDERAL REGISTER will appear at least 30 days prior to the public meetings. The notice will invite the public to comment on the proposal by letter, in person at the Area, District, or Headquarters Offices, or at one of the public meetings.

At the time the Draft Statement is made available to the public, Area Managers will provide copies of the Draft Statement to environmental groups, such as regional or local environmental councils, with an invitation to comment. Contact with these groups will be coordinated by the Environmental Office. Area Managers will provide the Environ-

Area Managers will provide the Environmental Office with copies of any written comments received, a summary of any oral comments, and a transcript of public meetings

held by them in their area.
5. Preparation of Final Environmental
Statement. After completion of the review
process, the comments that have been received from other agencies and the public
will be assembled by the Environmental
Office. This information will be submitted to
the Assistant Administrators of the program
division(s) involved in the proposed action
for review to determine, based on the comments received, (1) whether program or procedure adjustments are appropriate to
further reduce environmental impacts and
(2) whether additional or modified information should be included in the Final Environmental Statement.

After the resulting changes are made in the Draft Statement and the sections covering the comments received during the review are added, the Draft Statement becomes the Final Environmental Statement.

At that time, 15 copies of the Final Environmental Statement will be forwarded through the Assistant Secretary—Water and Power Resources to the Assistant Secretary for Program Policy. The statement will be accompanied by a draft notice of availability for inclusion in the Federal Register. Following the approval, the Assistant Secretary for Policy Planning and Research will forward the Statement to the Council on Environmental Quality.

After Departmental approval and formal transmittal of the Final Environmental Statement to the Council on Environmental Quality, copies of the final Statement will be supplied to the appropriate congressional committees and made available to the public.

H. Timing. Environmental Statements on budget items will be prepared and circulated in draft form by September 1 of the fiscal year before the year under consideration. Final Statements on these actions will be distributed after the President's budget transmittal but before any congressional hearings.

Final Environmental Statements on Administrative matters must be transmitted to the CEQ at least 30 days prior to the implementation of the proposed action.

mentation of the proposed action.

In any case, final decisions or commitments on actions to be included in an Environmental Statement may not be made prior to completion and submittal of the Statement. In emergency cases where this procedure cannot be followed, special arrangements must be made with the Assistant Secretary for Program Policy and the Council on Environmental Quality.

[FR Doc.72-725 Filed 1-18-72;8:50 am]

Bureau of Land Management

PROPOSED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE OFFSHORE EASTERN LOUISIANA

Inclusion of Alternatives to Proposed Action in Environmental Impact Statement

JANUARY 17, 1972.

In the Federal Register of October 28, 1971, the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior announced the availability of a final environmental impact statement relating to a proposed Outer Continental Shelf General Oil and Gas Lease Sale. The environmental statement considers 86 tracts of Outer Continental Shelf lands in the Gulf of Mexico offshore Eastern Louisiana which have been identified for oil and gas leasing potential.

Notice is hereby given that an addendum has been prepared to section IV of this statement relating to alternatives to the proposed action.

Reading copies of this addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Statement are available in the Department of the Interior Communications Office, and the Bureau of Land Management's Information Office, both in the Interior Building in Washington, D.C.

It is also available in the Bureau of Land Management's New Orleans Office. Copies may be obtained for \$1 each by writing to the Director, Bureau of Land Management (130), U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, or the Manager, Bureau of Land Management Outer Continental Shelf Office, Post Office Box 53226, New Orleans, LA 70153.

GEORGE L. TURCOTT, Acting Director, Bureau of Land Management.

[FR Doc.72-885 Filed 1-18-72;8:51 am]

Office of the Secretary

POTOMAC HERITAGE NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL

Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Statement

Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has prepared a draft environmental statement for the proposed Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail, Maryland-Virginia-District of Columbia-Pennsylvania-West Virginia. The environmental statement considers the probable impact of establishing a proposed Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail which would extend 874 miles traversing the length of the Potomac River from the mouth at the Chesapeake Bay to its source in the Appalachian Mountains. Copies are available for inspection at the following locations:

Office of Communications, Room 7200, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240. Telephone: (202) 343-4662.

Division of Information, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Room 4129, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240. Telephone: (202) 343-5726.

Office of Regional Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, 1421 Cherry Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102. Telephone: (215) 597-7989.

Office of Regional Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, 810 New Walton Building, Atlanta, GA 30303. Telephone: (404) 526-4405.

State Clearinghouse, Department of State Planning, 301 West Preston Street, Baltimore, MD 21201.

State Clearinghouse, Pennsylvania State Planning Board, 503 Finance Building, State Capitol, Harrisburg, Pa. 17120.

State Clearinghouse, Virginia Division of Planning and Community Affairs, 1010 James Madison Bullding, Richmond, Va. 23219.

State Clearinghouse, Office of Federal-State Relations, Office of the Governor, Charleston, W. Va. 25305.

Metropolitan Clearinghouse, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20036.

Metropolitan Clearinghouse, Cambria County Planning Commission, Courthouse, Ebensburg, Pa. 15931.

Metropolitan Clearinghouse, Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission, 564 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15219.

Copies may be obtained by writing the National Technical Information Service, Department of Commerce, Springfield, Va. 22151, and enclosing \$3. Please refer to the statement number above.

Dated: January 11, 1972.

ROGER C. B. MORTON, Secretary of the Interior.

[FR Doc.72-730 Filed 1-18-72;8:46 am]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Bureau of Standards GIRLS' APPAREL SIZES

Notice of Circulation for Acceptance of a Recommended Standard

The National Bureau of Standards is giving public notice and circulating for public comment the following recommended standard (TS) for a determination of its acceptance to manufacturers, distributors, users, and consumers:

TS 117, "Body Measurements for the Sizing of Girls' Apparel" This circulation is being made in accordance with the provisions of § 10.5 of the Department of Commerce Procedures for the Development of Voluntary Product Standards (15 CFR Part 10, as amended; 35 F.R. 8349 dated May 28, 1970).

Copies of this recommended standard may be obtained from the Office of Engineering Standards Services, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C. 20234. Written comments or objections concerning the standard should be addressed to the Office of Engineering Standards Services within 45 days following publication of this notice.

Dated: January 14, 1972.

LEWIS M. BRANSCOMB, Director.

[FR Doc.72-861 Filed 1-17-72;2:46 pm]

Office of Import Programs LEHIGH UNIVERSITY ET AL.

Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Articles

The following is a consolidated decision on applications for duty-free entry of scientific articles pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-651, 80 Stat. 897) and the regulations issued thereunder as amended (34 F.R. 15787 et seq.).

A copy of the record pertaining to this consolidated decision is available for public review during ordinary business hours of the Department of Commerce, at the Special Import Programs Division, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

Decision: Applications denied. Applicants have failed to establish that instruments or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign articles, for such purposes as the foreign articles are intended to be used, are not being manufactured in the United States.

Reasons: Section 602.5(e) (15 CFR 602.5) provides in pertinent part:

The applicant shall on or before the 20th day following the date of such notice [of denial without prejudice to resubmission], inform the Administrator whether it intends to resubmit another application for the same article to which the denied application relates. The applicant shall then resubmit the new application on or before the 90th day following the date of the notice of denial without prejudice to resubmission, unless an extension of time is granted by the Administrator in writing prior to the expiration of the 90-day period. * * * If the applicant fails within the applicable time periods specified above, to either (1) inform the Administrator whether it intends to resubmit another application for the same article to which the denial without prejudice to resubmission relates, or (2) resubmit the new application, the prior denial without prejudice to resub-mission shall have the effect of a final decision by the Administrator on the application within the context of the paragraph (d) of this section.

The meaning of paragraph (d) of 15 CFR 602.5 is that should an applicant either fail to notify the Administrator of

its intent to resubmit another application for the same article to which the denial without prejudice relates within the 20-day period, or fails to resubmit a new application within the 90-day period, the prior denial without prejudice to resubmission will have the effect of a final denial of the application.

None of the applicants to which this consolidated decision relates has satisfied the requirements set forth above, therefore, the prior denials without prejudice have the effect of a final decision denying their respective applications.

Section 602.5(e) further provides:

* * * the Administrator shall submit a summary of the prior denial without prejudice to resubmission to the FEDERAL REGIS-TER for publication, to the Commissioner of Customs, and to the applicant.

Each of the prior denials without prejudice to resubmission to which this consolidated decision relates was based on the failure of the respective applicants to submit the required documentation, including a completely executed application form, in sufficient detail to allow the issue of "scientific equivalency" to be determined by the Administrator.

Docket No. 70-00630-01-77030. Applicant: Lehigh University, Department of Chemistry, Bethlehem, Pa. 18015. Article: NMR Spectrometer, Model R-20A. Date of denial without prejudice to re-

submission: April 9, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00401-99-25100. Applicant: University of Hawaii, Chemistry Department, 2545 The Mall, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822. Aritcle: Ultrasonic drill. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 26, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00421-33-90000. Applicant: University of Chicago, 5727 Ellis Avenue, Jones Laboratory, Chicago, IL 60637. Article: Rotating anode X-ray generator, Model GX-6. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 26, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00206-33-46500. Applicant: University of Maryland, School of Medicine, Department of Pathology, 660 West Redwood Street, Howard Hall, Baltimore, MD 21201. Article: Ultramicrotome, Model "Om U2". Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: November 17, 1970.

Docket No. 70-00672-16-61800. Applicant: Vandalia-Butler City Schools, 366 South Dixie Drive, Vandalia, OH 45377. Article: Planetarium, Model Venus. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 9, 1971.

Docket No. 70-00685-73-59600. Applicant: University of California, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Post Office Box 990, Los Alamos, NM 87544. Article: Automat color processor, Model D7A. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 14, 1971.

Docket No. 70-00713-16-61800. Applicant: Tunkhannock Area School District, Philadelphia Avenue, Tunkhannock, PA 18657. Article: Planetarium, Mercury, Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 9, 1971.

Docket No. 70-00761-01-77040. Applicant: University of California, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Analytical Chemistry, 7000 East Avenue, Livermore, CA

94550. Article: Mass spectrometer, Model CH-5. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 9, 1971.

Docket No. 70-00808-75-42900. Applicant: Stanford University, 820 Quarry Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304. Article: Split coil magnet. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 14, 1971.

Docket No. 70-00812-16-61800. Applicant: University of Wisconsin—Marathon County Campus, 518 South Seventh Avenue, Wausau, WI 54401. Article: Planetarium, Model Venus. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 9, 1971.

Docket No. 70-00816-01-77040. Applicant: Rutgers, The State University, School of Chemistry, Wright Laboratory, New Brunswick, N.J. 08903. Article: Mass spectrometer, Model RMU-7. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 9, 1971.

Docket No. 70-00824-65-90000. Applicant: Battelle Memorial Institute, Pacific Northwest Laboratories, Post Office Box 999, Richland, WA 99352. Article: Rotating anode X-ray generator, Model RV-3V. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 9, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00024-82-01200. Applicant: U.S. Department of Labor, 5111 West 164th Street, Cleveland, OH 44142. Article: Miniature sound level meter and portable acoustic calibrator. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 21, 1971.

Docket No. 71–00081–80–30500. Applicant: Southwest Research Institute, 8500 Culebra Road, San Antonio, TX 78228. Article: Electromagnetic induction test unit. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 9, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00114-33-46500. Applicant: Rutger's University, Rutger's Medical School, New Brunswick, N.J. 08903. Article: Ultramicrotome, Model LKB 8800A. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 26, 1971.

Docket No. 71–00179–33–90500. Applicant: Veterans' Administration Hospital, Chief Supply Division, Building 222, Fort Snelling, St. Paul, Minn. 55111. Article: Vacuum press tool, Model 8. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 26, 1971.

Docket No. 71–00181–33–46096. Applicant: Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, 1740 Bainbridge Street, Philadelphia, PA 19146. Article: One microscope set, three pieces. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 21, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00204-88-43000. Applicant: Montana State University, Bozeman, Mont. 59715. Article: Astatic magnetometer NY-2 with optical lamp scale, sample stage and coil calibration set. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 21, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00215-16-61800. Applicant: Bays Mountain Nature Center, City Hall Building, 225 West Center Street, Kingsport, TN 37660. Article: Planetarium, Model Venus. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 26, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00262-00-61060. Applicant: South Dakota State University, Brookings, S. Dak. 57006. Article: Slip

819 NOTICES

rings with brushes. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission; April 21,

Docket No. 71-00263-33-46500. Applicant: University of Pennsylvania, Center for Oral Health Research, 4001 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. Article: Ultramicrotome, Om U2. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 21, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00272-33-46500. Appli-

cant: Georgetown University Medical School, Department of Obstetrics-Gynecology, 3800 Reservoir Road NW., Washington, DC 20007. Article: Ultramicrotome, Model LKB 8800A. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 21, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00289-38-25100. Applicant: Princeton University, Post Office Box 33, Princeton, NJ 08540. Article: Display system (educational equipment). Date of denial without prejudice to re-

submission: April 26, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00301-65-46040. Applicant: University of Connecticut, Institute of Materials Science, Storrs, Conn. 06268. Article: Electron microscope, HU-200F-. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 26, 1971.

Docket No. 71-00305-65-25100. Applicant: University of Missouri at Rolla, General Services Building, Purchasing Department, Rolla, Mo. 65401. Article: Boron carbide mortar and pestle. Date of denial without prejudice to resubmission: April 26, 1971.

SETH M. BODNER, Director, Office of Import Programs. [FR Doc.72-786 Filed 1-18-72:8:49 am]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration IN VITRO DIAGNOSTIC PRODUCTS FOR HUMAN USE

Notice to Manufacturers, Packers, and Distributors

The rapid growth in development of in vitro diagnostic products combined with the increasing use and reliance on the results by physicians, hospital personnel, and clinical laboratories, indicates that, except for the in vitro diagnostic products controlled through the licensing procedure pursuant to section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, these products need closer scrutiny because of the possibility that inaccurate and unreliable results may be obtained.

In vitro diagnostic products are those reagents, instruments, and kits which perform no anatomical, physiological, or therapeutic function, which are not injected into humans, and which are used solely to provide information on specimens taken from the human body.

Since these products are used for the diagnosis of disease in man, they clearly fall under the jurisdiction of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and in addition, for those products subject to the biological control provisions of the PHS Act, under the jurisdiction of section 351 of such act. Appropriate guidelines are necessary to insure that such products deliver a consistently high level of quality and performance. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act provides clear authority to exercise appropriate regulatory controls over these products as devices and/or drugs. With respect to diagnostic products subject to licensing under the PHS Act this regulatory control will continue to be exercised by the Division of Biologics Standards, NIH, PHS. (In vivo diagnostic products are presently controlled under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as drugs.)

The Food and Drug Administration believes that in order to assure users that results obtained through the use of these products are accurate and consistent and that their labeling claims conform to the purpose for which they are intended, it is necessary that scientific evidence be documented to clearly demonstrate the usefulness and reliability of these products to the health community. Tests, standards, and other controls must be developed to assure a high level of product quality, safety, and effectiveness.

The Food and Drug Administration will in the near future propose regulations governing in vitro diagnostic products. In the interim manufacturers, except those holding a license for biological diagnostic products, packers, and distributors of other in vitro diagnostic products should (1) seek or assemble evidence to demonstrate that such products are accurate and reliable, and thus safe and effective, and conform to appropriate good manufacturing practices in the manufacture, processing, packing, or holding of such products, (2) carefully test and evaluate such products prior to marketing in order to assure the dependability and consistency of results when used in accordance with their directions for use, and verify results against a generally accepted analytical test used for the same purpose, (3) perform adequate premarket testing to determine whether any predisposing test conditions or pa-tient abnormalities will affect the test so as to give inaccurate or undependable results, and (4) assure that the labeling for in vitro diagnostic products contains adequate directions for use so that such tests can be properly conducted by the user and, when followed, produce accurate, precise, and reliable data.

Labeling directions should include complete information on the accuracy, reproducibility, and sensitivity performance of such results as well as a complete description of external conditions and patient abnormalities which may affect the accuracy of such results. The degree of false positive and false negative results and, where such exist, specific directions for verifying test results should be clearly indicated. For products which consists of or include mechanical, electronic or other instrumentation to obtain results, the labeling should provide clear instruction for calibration and routine maintenance of such products. For reagents and chemicals used for such diagnostic purposes, the labeling should contain information on proper shipping, storage, and shelf life under conditions of normal use. For products which yield qualitative information only, the label-ing should explain that test results are limited to indicative rather than definitive or quantitative information.

The failure to conduct premarketing tests that are adequate and appropriate to demonstrate that such a diagnostic product is safe and effective under its labeling may cause the product to be misbranded under section 502(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and would in any event cause it to be misbranded under sections 201(n) and 502 (a) of the act unless the label bears a conspicuous front panel statement that the product has not been adequate tested for safety and may be unsafe and/or ineffective, and would cause any such product which is a drug to be in violation of section 505 of the Act.

This notice is issued pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (secs. 201(n), 502(a), 502(j), 701(a), 52 Stat. 1041, 1050, 1051, 1055; 21 U.S.C. 321(n), 352(a), 352(j), 371(a)) and under the authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs (21 CFR 2.120).

Dated: January 17, 1972.

CHARLES C. EDWARDS, Commissioner of Food and Drugs. [FR Doc.72-844 Filed 1-18-72;8:51 am]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard [CGFR 72-6]

NORFOLK HARBOR, VA.

Security Zone

By virtue of the authority vested in the Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, by Executive Order 10173, as amended (33 CFR Part 6), sec. 6(b) (1), 80 Stat. 937, 49 U.S.C. 1655(b)(1), 49 CFR 1.46(b) and the redelegation of authority to the Chief, Office of Marine Environment and Systems, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters as contained in the FEDERAL REGISTER of September 30, 1971 (36 F.R. 19160), I hereby affirm for publication in the Federal Register the order of H. E. Steel, Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads Area, Va., who has exercised authority as Captain of the Port, such order reading as follows:

NORFOLK HARBOR, VA.

SECURITY ZONE

Under the present authority of section 1, of title II of the Espionage Act of June 15, 1917, 40 Stat. 220, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 191, and Executive Order 10173, as amended, I declare that from 0900R January 21, 1972, until 1100R January 21, 1972, the following

[Dockets Nos. 50-324, 50-325]

area is a Security Zone and I order it be closed to any person or vessel due to transit of the U.S.S. America.

The waters of the Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor, Va., within the area between Elizabeth River Channel Lighted Buoy 14 LL 2952 at latitude 36°55′08″ N. and the Norfolk and Portsmouth Beltline Railroad Bridge which crosses the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River at latitude 36°48′41″ N.

No person or vessel shall remain in or enter this security zone without permission of the Captain of the Port, 393-9611, Ext. 220.

The Captain of the Port, Hampton Roads Area, shall enforce this order. In the enforcement of this order, the Captain of the Port may utilize, by appropriate agreement, personnel and facilities of any other Federal Agency or of any other State or political subdivision thereof.

For violation of this order, section 2 of title II of the Espionage Act of 15 June 1917 (40 Stat. 220 as amended, 50 U.S.C. 192), provides:

If the owner, agent, master, officer, or person in charge or any member of the crew of any such vessel falls to comply with any regulation or rule issued or order given under the provisions of this chapter, or obstructs or interferes with the exercise of any power conferred by this chapter, the vessel together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture to the United States in the same manner as merchandise is forfeited for the violations of the customs revenue laws; and the person guilty of such failure, obstruction, or interference shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000.

(a) If any other person knowingly falls to comply with any regulation or rule issued or order given under the provisions of this chapter, or knowingly obstructs or interferes with the exercise of any power conferred by this chapter, he shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years and may, at the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000.

Dated: January 14, 1972.

W. M. BENKERT, Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Marine Environment and Systems.

[FR Doc.72-781 Filed 1-18-72;8:48 am]

[CGFR 72-2]

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO. BRIDGE, COLUMBIA RIVER

Notice of Public Hearings Concerning Proposed Bridge Alteration; Correction

In F.R. Doc. 71–18986 published at page 25174 in the issue of Wednesday, December 29, 1971, the public hearing dates now reading "February 2 and 3, 1971" should read "February 2 and 3, 1972" wherever appearing in the first paragraph.

Dated: January 11, 1972.

W. M. BENKERT, Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Marine Environment and Systems.

[FR Doc.72-755 Filed 1-18-72;8:48 am]

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-293]

BOSTON EDISON CO.

Notice of Availability of Applicant's Supplemental Environmental Reports

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Atomic Energy Commission's regulations in Appendix D to 10 CFR Part 50, notice is hereby given that three reports entitled "Applicant's Environmental Report Supplements—Operating License Stage— Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station" submitted by the Boston Edison Co. are being placed in the Commission's Public Document Room at 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC, and in the Plymouth Public Library, North Street, Plymouth, Mass. 02360. The reports are also being made available to the public at the Office of Planning and Programing Coordination, 209 Leverett Saltonstall Building, 100 Cambridge Street, Boston, MA 02202 and at the Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Planning and Economic Development District, 68 Winthrop Street, Taunton, MA 02780.

These reports discuss environmental considerations related to the proposed operation of the Pilgram Nuclear Power Station located on the western shore of Cape Cod Bay in the town of Plymouth, Mass. Notice of Availability of the Applicant's Environmental Report dated September 14, 1970, was published in the Federal Register on October 16, 1970 (35 F.R. 16289). Copies of the environmental report are also available at the above locations.

After the reports have been analyzed by the Commission's Director of Regulation or his designee, a draft detailed statement of environmental considerations related to the proposed action will be prepared. Upon preparation of the draft detailed statement, the Commission will, among other things, cause to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER a summary notice of the availability of the draft detailed statement. The summary notice will request comments from interested persons on the proposed action and on the draft detailed statement. The summary notice will also contain a statement to the effect that the comments of Federal agencies and State and local officials thereon will be available when received.

Dated at Bethesda, Md., this 12th day of January 1972.

For the Atomic Energy Commission.

ROGER S. BOYD,
Assistant Director for Boiling
Water Reactors, Division of
Reactor Licensing.

[FR Doc.72-723 Filed 1-18-72;8:45 am]

CAROLINA POWER AND LIGHT CO.

Notice of Availability of Applicant's Supplemental Environmental Report

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Atomic Energy Commission's regulations in Appendix D to 10 CFR Part 50, notice is hereby given that a report entitled "Environmental Report—Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Units 1 and 2" submitted by the Carolina Power and Light Co., is being placed in the Commission's Public Document Room at 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC, and in the Southport-Brunswick County Library, 109 West Moore Street, Southport, NC 28461. The report is also being made available to the public at the Office of the Planning Coordinator, Clearinghouse and Information Center, Post Office Box 1351, Raleigh, NC 27602, and the Cape Fear Council of Local Governments, Room 509, CP&L Building, Wilmington, NC 28401.

This report discusses environmental considerations related to the construction of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Units 1 and 2 located in the town of Southport, Brunswick County, N.C. After the report has been analyzed by the Commission's Director of Regulation or his designee, a draft detailed statement of environmental considerations related to the proposed action will be prepared. Upon preparation of the draft detailed statement, the Commission will, among other things, cause to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER a summary notice of availability of the draft detailed statement. The summary notice will request comments from interested persons on the proposed action and on the draft statement. The summary notice will also contain a statement to the effect that the comments of Federal agencies and State and local officials thereon will be available when received.

Dated at Bethesda, Md., this 7th day of January 1972.

For the Atomic Energy Commission.

ROGER S. BOYD,
Assistant Director for Boiling
Water Reactors, Division of
Reactor Licensing.

[FR Doc.72-724 Filed 1-18-72;8:45 am]

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Docket Nos. 24122, etc.; Order 72-1-42]

AUTOMOTIVE CARGO INVESTIGATION ET AL.

Order Instituting Investigation

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C., on the 14th day of January 1972.

Automotive Cargo Investigation, Docket 24122; in the matter of Universal Airlines, Inc., exemption authority; Docket 23128; application of Ortner Air Service,